UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/627,252	07/28/2000	Joseph Skeffington Wholey III	07470-050001	2390

7590 10/28/2002

Kenyon S Jenckes
Fish & Richardson PC
4350 La Jolla Village Drive Suite 500
San Diago, CA 92122

EXAMINER
AMINI, JAVID A

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2672	

DATE MAILED: 10/28/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/627,252	WHOLEY III ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Javid A Amini	2672

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____ .

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) 1-39 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) 1-39 is/are rejected.

7)☒ Claim(s) 1-39 is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11)☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a)☐ approved b)☐ disapproved by the Examiner.

If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____ .

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).

a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ .
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: .

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.

Claims 1-39 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by Hoffberg et al. U.S. patent 6,400,996 B1 with filing date of Feb. 1, 1999.

1. Claim 1,

Hoffberg et al., hereinafter, Hoffberg, discloses, "(a) retrieving a runtime parameter for the graph at runtime execution of the graph, the runtime parameter having a value defined as determinable at runtime execution of the graph", in Fig. 3 graphically shows the differences in second (s) (runtime parameter) between total time (runtime execution) for the prior art for each user. The most popular and accessible example is Windows 2000 under control panel and system management, the run time parameters to execute the values defined for performance of CPU or hard drive or any other hardware and software can be illustrated.

Hoffberg, discloses, "(b) determining whether the value for the runtime parameter is to be provided by user input", in abstract that the apparatus receives an input from the user and other data. The user presents a predicted input for confirmation, and the predictive mechanism is updated based on this feedback, therefore the user can provide the runtime parameters.

Hoffberg, discloses, "(c) displaying a prompt to a user for receiving user input for every runtime parameter so determined", in Fig. 15 user accept confirmation screen, which means displaying a prompt to a user. There are two options one is manual (displaying a prompt to a user to confirm the

execution) and the other one is fully automated (the system equipped with management application usually called smart system).

Hoffberg discloses, "(d) determining a first final parameter value based on user response to such prompt", in Figs. 10 and 11 the parameter value based on user response to interfaces.

Hoffberg, discloses, "(e) executing the graph using the first final parameter value as the value for the runtime parameter", in Figs. 10 and 11 the parameters on time axes can be used as the value for the runtime parameter.

2. Claim 2,

Hoffberg teaches, "(a) determining whether the value for the runtime parameter is to be externally supplied programmatically", in (col. 41, lines 49-67) that external input/output can be provided as user requirements.

Hoffberg discloses, (b) retrieving any externally supplied value for every runtime parameter so determined", in (col. 41, lines 49-67) retrieving external sources can be determined.

Hoffberg teaches, "(c) determining a second final parameter value based on such externally supplied value", in Fig. 11 indicated the comparison between the first and second parameter value.

Hoffberg teaches, (d) executing the graph using the second final parameter value as the value for the runtime parameter", in Fig. 11 shown the executed graph with second parameter value.

3. Claim 3,

Hoffberg, discloses, "providing an interface, which permits designating a parameter of a graph component as a runtime parameter", in (col. 41, lines 49-67) since the system is working as a control system,

therefore, an interface can be provided as a reference value to determined the runtime parameters.

4. Claim 4,

Hoffberg, discloses, "wherein determining the first final parameter value includes evaluating an expression", in (col. 41, lines 49-67), this step is inherent in control system because parameter value are always evaluating an expression. That is why it calls a control system.

5. Claim 5,

Hoffberg, discloses, "the expression computes metadata", the step is inherent because the system preferably maintains an updated index of available data. Thus, newly acquired data is added to the index, and deleted data is purged from the index. The system preferably compares new data to previously encountered data, to avoid redundant processing. For example, the system preferably recognizes events/programs that have previously been recorded, and checks to determine whether they are still in the index. In this context, the user is preferably provided with low-level file maintenance tools, for example to manually control the addition or deletion of data, which is then correctly represented in the index.

6. Claim 6,

Hoffberg, discloses, "wherein determining the second final parameter value includes evaluating an expression", in (col. 41, lines 49-67), this step is inherent in control system because parameter value are always evaluating an expression. That is why it calls a control system.

7. Claim 7,

Hoffberg, discloses, "the expression computes metadata", the step is inherent because the system preferably maintains an updated index of available data. Thus, newly acquired data is added to the index, and deleted data is purged from the index. The system preferably compares new data to previously encountered data, to avoid redundant processing. For example, the system preferably recognizes events/programs that have previously been recorded, and checks to determine whether they are still in the index. In this context, the user is preferably provided with low-level file maintenance tools, for example to manually control the addition or deletion of data, which is then correctly represented in the index.

8. Claim 8,

Hoffberg, discloses, "displaying the prompt depends upon evaluation of user input to a prior displayed prompt", in (col. 59, lines 19-32), this step is inherent in control system because, in these systems, typically a content descriptive data stream formulated by human editors accompanies the broadcast or is available for processing and analysis. Based on a relation of the user preferences, which may be implied by actual viewing habits or input through simple accept/veto user feedback, selected media events may be recorded.

9. Claim 9,

Hoffberg, discloses, "(a) determining at runtime execution of the graph whether any component of the graph is defined as being a conditional component having a condition and a condition interpretation", in (col. 53, lines 2-

9) the ability of the interface of the present invention to perform abstractions and make decisions regarding a closeness of presented data to selection criteria makes the interface suitable for use in a programmable control, determining the existence of certain conditions and taking certain actions on the occurrence of detected events.

Hoffberg, discloses, "(b) evaluating the condition for every such conditional component", in (col. 57, lines 6-15) while the present interface is preferably learning and adaptive, it may also detect events and make decisions based on known or predetermined characteristics. Where a number of criteria are evaluated for making a decision, conflicts among the various criteria are resolved based on a strength of an evaluated criteria, a weighting of the criteria, an interactivity function relating the various criteria, a user preference, either explicitly or implicitly determined, and a contextual analysis. Thus, a user override or preference input may be provided to assist in resolving conflicts.

Hoffberg, discloses, "(c) modifying the graph at runtime execution of the graph in accordance with such evaluation and the corresponding condition-interpretation of such conditional component", in (col. 70, lines 20-25) the apparatus may further comprise an input for receiving feedback from the programmer indicating a concurrence with the control output of the processor, and modifying the response control based on the received feedback to increase a likelihood of concurrence.

10. Claim 10,

Hoffberg discloses, "wherein modifying the graph includes removing the conditional component and all connected flows to such conditional component from the graph before execution of the graph based on a first evaluation of the condition and the corresponding condition-interpretation for such conditional component", in

(col. 73, lines 53-60) wherein the control means provides an option, selectable by the input means in conjunction with the display means, for changing an input program instruction prior to execution by the control means, so that the apparatus enters a state wherein a new program instruction may be input to substitute for the changed input step, wherein the control means verifies the program instructions so that the program instructions are executable by the control means.

11. Claim 11,

Hoffberg discloses, "further including removing each component and flows connected to such components that depend on the presence of the conditional component", in Fig. 18 once this characteristic is detected and quantified, an adaptive filter may be applied by the main control 1806 to selectively remove the detected component from the signal, in order to improve the reliability of the detection of other characteristics and to determine the intended act of the user.

12. Claim 12,

Hoffberg discloses, "wherein modifying the graph includes replacing the conditional component with a flow before execution of the graph based on a second evaluation of the condition and the corresponding condition interpretation for such conditional component", in (col. 73, lines 53-60) wherein the control means provides an option, selectable by the input means in conjunction with the display means, for changing an input program instruction prior to execution by the control means, so that the apparatus enters a state wherein a new program instruction may be input to substitute for the

changed input step, wherein the control means verifies the program instructions so that the program instructions are executable by the control means.

13. Claim 13,

Hoffberg discloses, "further including an interface which permits designating a condition and a condition interpretation for a graph component", in (col. 99, lines 40-50) an adaptive user interface level concept is not limited to any particular embodiment, and in fact, may be broadly used wherever a system includes an interface which is intended to use by both experienced and inexperienced users.

14. Claim 14,

Hoffberg discloses, "(a) means for retrieving a runtime parameter for the graph at runtime execution of the graph, the runtime parameter having a value defined as determinable at runtime execution of the graph", in Fig. 3 that graphically shows the differences in second between total time (runtime execution) for the prior art for each user.

Hoffberg discloses, "(b) means for determining whether the value for the runtime parameter is to be provided by user input", in abstract that the apparatus receives an input from the user and other data. The user presents a predicted input for confirmation, and the predictive mechanism is updated based on this feedback.

Hoffberg discloses, "(c) means for displaying a prompt to a user for receiving user input for every runtime parameter so determined", in Fig. 15 user accept confirmation screen, which means displaying a prompt to a user.

Hoffberg discloses, "(d) means for determining a first final parameter value based on user response to such prompt", in Figs. 10 and 11 the parameter value based on user response to interfaces.

Hoffberg discloses, "(e) means for executing the graph using the first final parameter value as the value for the runtime parameter", in Figs. 10 and 11 the parameters on time axes can be used as the value for the runtime parameter.

15. Claim 15,

Hoffberg discloses, "(a) means for determining whether the value for the runtime parameter is to be externally supplied programmatically", in (col. 41, lines 49-67) that external input/output can be provided as user requirements.

Hoffberg discloses, "(b) means for retrieving any externally supplied value for every runtime parameter so determined", in (col. 41, lines 49-67) retrieving external sources can be determined.

Hoffberg discloses, "(c) means for determining a second final parameter value based on such externally supplied value", in Fig. 11 indicated the comparison between the first and second parameter value.

Hoffberg discloses, "(d) means for executing the graph using the second final parameter value as the value for the runtime parameter", in Fig. 11 shown the executed graph with second parameter value.

16. Claim 16,

Hoffberg discloses, "further including an interface which permits designating a parameter of a graph component as a runtime parameter", in (col. 41, lines 49-67) since the system is working as a control system, therefore, an interface can be provided as a reference value to determined the runtime parameters.

17. Claim 17,

Hoffberg discloses, "wherein the means for determining the first final parameter value includes means for evaluating an expression", in (col. 41, lines 49-67), this step is inherent in control system because parameter value is always evaluating an expression. That is why it calls a control system.

18. Claim 18,

Hoffberg discloses, "wherein the expression computes metadata", the step is inherent because the system preferably maintains an updated index of available data. Thus, newly acquired data is added to the index, and deleted data is purged from the index. The system preferably compares new data to previously encountered data, to avoid redundant processing. For example, the system preferably recognizes events/programs that have previously been recorded, and checks to determine whether they are still in the index. In this context, the user is preferably provided with low-level file maintenance tools, for example to manually control the addition or deletion of data, which is then correctly represented in the index.

19. Claim 19,

Hoffberg discloses, "wherein the means for determining the second final parameter value includes means for evaluating an expression", in (col. 41, lines 49-67), this step is inherent in control system because parameter value is always evaluating an expression. That is why it calls a control system.

20. Claim 20,

Hoffberg discloses, "Wherein the expression computes metadata", the step is inherent because the system preferably maintains an updated index of available data. Thus, newly acquired data is added to the index, and deleted data is purged from the index. The system preferably compares new data to previously encountered data, to avoid redundant processing. For example, the system preferably recognizes events/programs that have previously been recorded, and checks to determine whether they are still in the index. In this context, the user is preferably provided with low-level file maintenance tools, for example to manually control the addition or deletion of data, which is then correctly represented in the index.

21. Claim 21,

Hoffberg discloses, "wherein a prompt for receiving user input is conditional, and displaying the prompt depends upon evaluation of user input to a prior displayed prompt", in (col. 59, lines 19-32), this step is inherent in control system because, in these systems, typically a content descriptive data stream formulated by human editors accompanies the broadcast or is available for processing and analysis. Based on a relation of the user preferences, which may be implied by actual viewing habits or input through simple accept/veto user feedback, selected media events may be recorded.

22. Claim 22,

Hoffberg discloses, "(a) means for determining at runtime execution of the graph whether any component of the graph is defined as being a conditional component having a condition and a condition-interpretation", in Fig. 3

that graphically shows the differences in second between total time (runtime execution) for the prior art for each user.

Hoffberg discloses, "(b) means for evaluating the condition for every such conditional component", in (col. 57, lines 6-15) while the present interface is preferably learning and adaptive, it may also detect events and make decisions based on known or predetermined characteristics. Where a number of criteria are evaluated for making a decision, conflicts among the various criteria are resolved based on a strength of an evaluated criteria, a weighting of the criteria, an interactivity function relating the various criteria, a user preference, either explicitly or implicitly determined, and a contextual analysis. Thus, a user override or preference input may be provided to assist in resolving conflicts.

Hoffberg discloses, "(c) means for modifying the graph at runtime execution of the graph in accordance with such evaluation and the corresponding condition-interpretation of such conditional component", in (col. 70, lines 20-25) the apparatus may further comprise an input for receiving feedback from the programmer indicating a concurrence with the control output of the processor, and modifying the response control based on the received feedback to increase a likelihood of concurrence.

23. Claim 23,

Hoffberg discloses, "wherein the means for modifying the graph includes means for removing the conditional component and all connected flows to such conditional component from the graph before execution of the graph based on a first evaluation of the condition and the corresponding condition-interpretation for such conditional component", in (col. 73, lines 53-60) wherein the control means provides an option, selectable by the input means in conjunction with the display means, for changing an input program instruction prior to execution by the control means, so that the apparatus enters a state wherein a

new program instruction may be input to substitute for the changed input step, wherein the control means verifies the program instructions so that the program instructions are executable by the control means.

24. Claim 24,

Hoffberg discloses, "further including means for removing each component and flows connected to such components that depend on the presence of the conditional component", in Fig. 18 once this characteristic is detected and quantified, an adaptive filter may be applied by the main control 1806 to selectively remove the detected component from the signal, in order to improve the reliability of the detection of other characteristics and to determine the intended act of the user.

25. Claim 25,

Hoffberg discloses, "wherein the means for modifying the graph includes means for replacing the conditional component with a flow before execution of the graph based on a second evaluation of the condition and the corresponding condition-interpretation for such conditional component", in (col. 73, lines 53-60) wherein the control means provides an option, selectable by the input means in conjunction with the display means, for changing an input program instruction prior to execution by the control means, so that the apparatus enters a state wherein a new program instruction may be input to substitute for the changed input step, wherein the control means verifies the program instructions so that the program instructions are executable by the control means.

26. Claim 26,

Hoffberg discloses, "further including an interface which permits designating a condition and a condition-interpretation for a graph component", in (col. 99, lines 40-50) an adaptive user interface level concept is not limited to any particular embodiment, and in fact, may be broadly used wherever a system includes an interface which is intended to use by both experienced and inexperienced users.

27. Claim 27,

Hoffberg discloses, "(a) retrieve a runtime parameter for the graph at runtime execution of the graph, the runtime parameter having a value defined as determinable at runtime execution of the graph", in Fig. 3 that graphically shows the differences in second between total time (runtime execution) for the prior art for each user.

Hoffberg discloses, "(b) determine whether the value for the runtime parameter is to be provided by user input", in (col. 57, lines 6-15) while the present interface is preferably learning and adaptive, it may also detect events and make decisions based on known or predetermined characteristics. Where a number of criteria are evaluated for making a decision, conflicts among the various criteria are resolved based on a strength of an evaluated criteria, a weighting of the criteria, an interactivity function relating the various criteria, a user preference, either explicitly or implicitly determined, and a contextual analysis. Thus, a user override or preference input may be provided to assist in resolving conflicts.

Hoffberg discloses, "(c) display a prompt to a user for receiving user input for every runtime parameter so determined", in Fig. 15 user accept confirmation screen, which means displaying a prompt to a user.

Hoffberg discloses, "(d) determine a first final parameter value based on user response to such prompt", in Figs. 10 and 11 the parameter value based on user response to interfaces.

Hoffberg discloses, "(e) execute the graph using the first final parameter value as the value for the runtime parameter", in Figs. 10 and 11 the parameters on time axes can be used as the value for the runtime parameter.

28. Claim 28,

Hoffberg discloses, "(a) determine whether the value for the runtime parameter is to be externally supplied programmatically", in (col. 41, lines 49-67) that external input/output can be provided as user requirements.

Hoffberg discloses, "(b) retrieve any externally supplied value for every runtime parameter so determined", in (col. 41, lines 49-67) retrieving external sources can be determined.

Hoffberg discloses, "(c) determine a second final parameter value based on such externally supplied value", in Fig. 11 indicated the comparison between the first and second parameter value.

Hoffberg discloses, "(d) execute the graph using the second final parameter value as the value for the runtime parameter", in Fig. 11 shown the executed graph with second parameter value.

29. Claim 29,

Hoffberg discloses, "further including instructions for causing the computer to provide an interface which permits designating a parameter of a graph component as a runtime parameter", in (col. 41, lines 49-67) since the system is working as a control system, therefore, an interface can be provided as a reference value to determined the runtime parameters.

30. Claim 30,

Hoffberg discloses, "wherein the instructions for causing the computer to determine the first final parameter value include instructions for causing the computer to evaluating an expression", this step is inherent in control system because parameter value are always evaluating an expression. That is why it calls a control system.

31. Claim 31,

Hoffberg discloses, "wherein the expression computes metadata", the step is inherent because the system preferably maintains an updated index of available data. Thus, newly acquired data is added to the index, and deleted data is purged from the index. The system preferably compares new data to previously encountered data, to avoid redundant processing. For example, the system preferably recognizes events/programs that have previously been recorded, and checks to determine whether they are still in the index. In this context, the user is preferably provided with low-level file maintenance tools, for example to manually control the addition or deletion of data, which is then correctly represented in the index.

32. Claim 32,

Hoffberg discloses, "wherein the instructions for causing the computer to determine the second final parameter value include instructions for causing the computer to evaluating an expression", this step is inherent in control system because parameter value are always evaluating an expression. That is why it calls a control system.

33. Claim 33,

Hoffberg discloses, "wherein the expression computes metadata", the step is inherent because the system preferably maintains an updated index of available data. Thus, newly acquired data is added to the index, and deleted data is purged from the index. The system preferably compares new data to previously encountered data, to avoid redundant processing. For example, the system preferably recognizes events/programs that have previously been recorded, and checks to determine whether they are still in the index. In this context, the user is preferably provided with low-level file maintenance tools, for example to manually control the addition or deletion of data, which is then correctly represented in the index.

34. Claim 34,

Hoffberg discloses, "wherein a prompt for receiving user input is conditional, and displaying the prompt depends upon evaluation of user input to a prior displayed prompt", in (col. 59, lines 19-32), this step is inherent in control system because, in these systems, typically a content descriptive data stream formulated by human editors accompanies the broadcast or is available for processing and analysis. Based on a relation of the user preferences, which may be implied by actual viewing habits or input through simple accept/veto user feedback, selected media events may be recorded.

35. Claim 35,

Hoffberg discloses, "(a) determine at runtime execution of the graph whether any component of the graph is defined as being a conditional component having a condition and a condition interpretation", in (col. 53, lines 2-9) the ability of the interface of the present invention to perform abstractions and make decisions regarding a closeness of presented data to selection criteria makes the interface suitable for use in a programmable control, determining the existence of certain conditions and taking certain actions on the occurrence of detected events.

Hoffberg discloses, "(b) evaluate the condition for every such conditional component", in (col. 57, lines 6-15) while the present interface is preferably learning and adaptive, it may also detect events and make decisions based on known or predetermined characteristics. Where a number of criteria are evaluated for making a decision, conflicts among the various criteria are resolved based on a strength of an evaluated criteria, a weighting of the criteria, an interactivity function relating the various criteria, a user preference, either explicitly or implicitly determined, and a contextual analysis. Thus, a user override or preference input may be provided to assist in resolving conflicts.

Hoffberg discloses, "(c) modify the graph at runtime execution of the graph in accordance with such evaluation and the corresponding condition-interpretation of such conditional component", in (col. 70, lines 20-25) the apparatus may further comprise an input for receiving feedback from the programmer indicating a concurrence with the control output of the processor, and modifying the response control based on the received feedback to increase a likelihood of concurrence.

36. Claim 36,

Hoffberg discloses, "wherein the instructions for causing the computer to modify the graph include instructions for causing the computer to remove the conditional component and all connected flows to such conditional component from the graph before execution of the graph based on a first evaluation of the condition and the corresponding condition-interpretation for such conditional component", in (col. 73, lines 53-60) wherein the control means provides an option, selectable by the input means in conjunction with the display means, for changing an input program instruction prior to execution by the control means, so that the apparatus enters a state wherein a new program instruction may be input to substitute for the changed input step, wherein the control means verifies the program instructions so that the program instructions are executable by the control means.

37. Claim 37,

Hoffberg discloses, "further including instructions for causing the computer to remove each component and flows connected to such components that depend on the presence of the conditional component", in Fig. 18 once this characteristic is detected and quantified, an adaptive filter may be applied by the main control 1806 to selectively remove the detected component from the signal, in order to improve the reliability of the detection of other characteristics and to determine the intended act of the user.

38. Claim 38,

Hoffberg discloses, "wherein the instructions for causing the computer to modify the graph include instructions for causing the computer to replace the conditional component with a flow before execution of the graph based on a second evaluation of the condition and the corresponding condition-interpretation for such conditional component", in (col. 73, lines 53-60) wherein the control means provides an option, selectable by the input

means in conjunction with the display means, for changing an input program instruction prior to execution by the control means, so that the apparatus enters a state wherein a new program instruction may be input to substitute for the changed input step, wherein the control means verifies the program instructions so that the program instructions are executable by the control means.

39. Claim 39,

Hoffberg discloses, "further including instructions for causing the computer to provide an interface which permits designating a condition and a condition interpretation for a graph component", in (col. 99, lines 40-50) an adaptive user interface level concept is not limited to any particular embodiment, and in fact, may be broadly used wherever a system includes an interface which is intended to use by both experienced and inexperienced users.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Javid A Amini whose telephone number is 703-605-4248. The examiner can normally be reached on 8-5pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael Razavi can be reached on 703-305-4713. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-746-8705 for regular communications and 703-746-8705 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-306-0377.

Javid Amini
October 22, 2002

MICHAEL RAZAVI
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600